



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/583,263	06/14/2006	Yasuko Maruo	96790P543	9073
8791 7590 12/15/2008 BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP 1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040				
EXAMINER				
WHITE, DENNIS MICHAEL				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1797				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/15/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/583,263

Applicant(s)

MARUO ET AL.

Examiner

DENNIS M. WHITE

Art Unit

1797

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 June 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 June 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CIS-100)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 06/14/2006
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 7 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The limitation "aqueous solution in which said dye and said humectant whose wt% is 10% to 50% are dissolved" is unclear. Is the wt% the combined weight of the dye and humectant? Or is it each individually?

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-3, 5, 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Omatsu (JP 2001343380 A).
5. Regarding claims 1-3, 5, and 13, Omatsu teaches an ozone gas sensing element comprising: a changing layer made of paper, glass, textiles, or fibrous sheets ("a porous material" "porous material is transparent") and an ink that

Art Unit: 1797

contains anthraquinone dye for ozone detection ("sensing agent formed in pores of said porous material" "said sensing agent contains a dye which changes absorption in a visible region by reacting with ozone") (Para. 0011-014); and an overcoat layer ("light-transmitting gas selective permeable film which covers a surface of said porous material") (Para. 0027), wherein, the overcoat ("said gas selective permeable film") comprises polyvinyl alcohol ("an organic polymer which uses, as a monomer, a compound made of a chainlike molecule containing a vinyl group") (Para. 0028).

Regarding claim 14, Omatsu teaches the organic polymer comprises a polymer lactic acid copolymer (Para. 0028).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

8. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9. Claims 4, 6-12, 15-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Omatsu (JP 2001343380 A) in view of Maruo (US 2004/0131501 A1).

Omatsu teach the limitations of claims 1-3, 5, 13-14 as per above.

Regarding claims 4, 6-8, 10-11, 17-22, 24-26, 32, Omatsu is silent about the pore size, containing a humectant such as glycerin, containing acetic acid or a pH buffering agent.

Maruo et al teach an ozone gas sensing element comprising a dye solution prepared by dissolving, in water, indigo carmine disodium salt as a dye (stain), acetic acid as an acid, and glycerol as a hygroscopic compound. The indigo carmine ("dye contains an indigo ring") disodium salt concentration is 0.4%, the acetic acid concentration is 1 N, and the glycerol ("glycerin") concentration is 10.0% ("which said dye and said humectant whose wt % is 10%

Art Unit: 1797

to 50% are dissolved") (Para. 0158 and 0165). The sensing element is deposited in the pores of a porous material, wherein the pores are 20nm or less ("thereby impregnating said porous material with said aqueous solution, and drying said porous material") (Para. 0063).

It is desirable to have a pore size of 20nm or less because when the sensing element is made of porous glass (borosilicate glass), light passes in the visible light region (350 nm to 800 nm) in measurement of the transmission spectrum in the UV visible wavelength region (wavelength: 200 nm to 2,000 nm) by setting the average pore diameter to 20 nm or less. For a larger average pore diameter, an abrupt decrease in transmittance in the visible region is observed (Para 0063).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as motivated by Maruo to use the pore size of 20nm or less in the porous material of Omatsu in order to provide adequate transmittance of visible light.

It is desirable to use glycerol ("a humectant") because the hygroscopic compound contains water, even addition of moisture upon a humidity change has little influence. Thus, disturbance of humidity can be reduced (Para. 0165).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as motivated by Maruo to use glycerol in order to avoid the affect of humidity on the ozone measurements.

It is desirable to use acetic acid because it increases the absorbance around 600 nm. (Para. 0124 and 0155).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as motivated by Maruo to use acetic acid in the device of Omatsu in order to increase the absorbance around 600nm, which is an optimal wavelength to detect a color change in dyes that react with ozone.

It is desirable to use indigo carmine as the dye to detect ozone because it is a dye that changes in the absorbance of the visible region upon reaction with ozone gas and is not affected by other acid gases in the atmosphere because the carbon-carbon double bond in an indigo ring contained in the dye is only broken by ozone gas deposited in the pores of the sensing element almost free from disturbance of an acid gas, and the electron state of the dye molecule changes to change the absorption spectrum of the visible region. (Para. 0150).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as motivated by Maruo to substitute indigo carmine for the anthraquinone dye to avoid the affect of other acid gases in the atmosphere in ozone detection.

Regarding claims 18-19, Omatsu/Maruo teach the substrate can be woody material, paper, or other fibrous sheets ("sheet-like carrier made of fibers" "made of cellulose") (Omatsu: 0011).

Regarding claims 9 and 23, Omatsu/Maruo teach the percent weight of glycerin is 10%. Omatsu/Maruo do not teach the wt% of glycerin is 30%. The percent of hygroscopic material is a result effective variable that depends on the humidity. It is desirable to increase the amount of glycerin if the humidity is higher.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to optimize the device of Omatsu/Maruo by increasing the glycerin wt% from 10% to 50% in order to reduce the effect of humidity on ozone sensing.

Regarding claims 12 and 27, Omatsu/Maruo teach the acid can comprise a buffer solution such as phosphoric acid and sodiumdihydrogenphosphate dehydrate ("solution is made acidic by a pH buffering agent made of an acid and a salt thereof") (Maruo: Para. 0176).

Regarding claim 28, Omatsu/Maruo teach the ozone indicator can comprise a changing layer, a non-changing layer, and one layer of overcoat layers, or they may laminate two or more layers, respectively. ("plurality of ozone sensing sheets") (Omatsu: Para. 0037).

Regarding claims 29-32, Omatsu/Maruo teach the overcoat ("a gas amount limiting layer formed on a surface of said ozone sensing sheet") is formed above some of the changing layer ("including a hole" "a gas amount limiting cover formed to cover said ozone sensing sheet, and including an opening in a portion thereof"). There can be a non-changing layer on the changing layer that is covered by the overcoat. ("characterized by further comprising a gas permeable film covering the opening") (Para. 0026 and 0039-0041). Omatsu/Maruo are silent about a plurality of holes. The Courts have held that the mere duplication of parts, without any new or unexpected results, is within the ambit of a person of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Harza*, 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate a plurality of holes with the apparatus of Omatsu/Maruo in order to have multiple sites where the changing layer is exposed to ozone for detection.

Regarding claim 33, Omatsu/Maruo teach the polymer is polyacrylic acid ("said monomer comprises at least one of acrylic acid, acrylonitrile, methacrylic acid, methyl methacrylate, vinyl chloride, and vinylidene chloride") (Para. 0028).

Regarding claim 34, Omatsu/Maruo teach the organic polymer comprises a copolymer (Para. 0028).

Regarding claims 15-16 and 35-36, Omatsu/Maruo teach the organic polymer comprises acrylic resin, polyacrylic acid, polyvinyl alcohol, vinyl acetate resin. Omatsu/Maruo are silent about the organic polymer comprises the acrylic resin polymethylmethacrylate that has a molecular weight of not less than 100,000. It is held to be obvious to select a well known plastic to make a container of a type made of plastics prior to the invention (In re Leshin, 227 F.2d 197, 125 USPQ 416 (CCPA 1960)). It is desirable for the organic polymer to be the acrylic resin polymethylmethacrylate that has a molecular weight of not less than 100,000 because it is a known organic polymer that is transparent (to allow for reading of the changing layer) and the high molecular weight allows for the transition temperature to be higher to increase the glass transition temperature.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute the acrylic resin of Omatsu/Maruo with the well known acrylic resin polymethylmethacrylate that has a molecular weight of not less than 100,000

Art Unit: 1797

because it is transparent (to allow for reading of the changing layer) and the high molecular weight allows for the glass transition temperature to be higher which allows for a more stable overcoat layer.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Chiang et al disclose a thin film made of PMMA that with a molar mass and polydispersity of 100,000 g/mol and 2.26, respectively. A differential scanning calorimeter (DSC) test at a heating rate of 20 °C/min starting from room temperature indicated that the PMMA has a glass transition temperature (T_g) of ca. 105 °C.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DENNIS M. WHITE whose telephone number is (571)270-3747. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, EST 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill Warden can be reached on (571) 272-1267. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1797

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Lyle A Alexander/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1797

/dmw/